## 1st November 1890.

## BANGALORE AND MYSORE DISTRICTS.

Subjects Nos. 177 to 282 described below were discussed at this meeting :—

*Bangalore District.*—Subjects Nos. 177 to 185 were introduced by Mr. Nandigudi Ramanna, Representative Member for Hoskote Taluk, Nos. 186 and 187 by Mr. Dasappa, R. M., Nelamangala Taluk, Nos. 188 to 194 by Mr. Srikanta Rao, R. M., Devanhalli Taluk, Nos. 195 to 211 by Mr. Rangaiengar, R. M., Closepet Taluk, Nos. 212 and 213 by Mr. Linge Gauda, R. M., Kankanhalli Taluk, Nos. 214 & 215 by Mr. Srinivasa Chetti, R. M., Kankanhalli Taluk, No. 216 by Mr. Channegauda, R. M., Dodballapur Taluk, Nos. 217 to 219 by Mr. Annaiyachar, R. M., Magadi Taluk, No. 220 by Mr. H. Krishnappa, R. M., Closepet Taluk, Nos. 221 to 224 by Mr. Nanjunda Sastri, representing the Bangalore Rate Payers' Association and No. 225 relates to Public Works proposed for the Bangalore District. *Mysore District.*—Subjects Nos. 226 to 230 were introduced by Mr. Advocate Raghavachar, Representative Member for Seringapatam Taluk, Nos. 231 to 236 by Mr. Amble Annaiya Pandit, Nos. 237 to 239 by Mr. Pensioned Amildar Hanumanta Rao, Special Representative Member for the Mysore District, Nos. 240 to 242 by Mr. Krishna Rao, R. M., Mysore Taluk, Nos. 243 to 245 by Mr. Ramanarasaiya, R. M., Mandya Taluk, No. 246 by Mr. Shankarnaranappa, R. M., Nanjangud Taluk, No. 247 by Mr. Kalale Kalashetti, R. M., Chamrajnagar Taluk, Nos. 248 to 261 by Mr. Rangaiengar, R. M., Heggaddevankote Taluk, Nos. 262 and 263 by Mr. Honna Shetti, R. M., Gundlupet Taluk, Nos. 264 to 268 by Mr. Anandalwaraiengar, R. M., Nagamangala Taluk, Nos. 269 and 270 by Mr. Revanna Devaru, R. M., Tirumakudlu-Narsipur Taluk, Nos. 271 to 273 by Mr. Rangaiengar, R. M., Attikuppa Taluk, Nos. 274 to 276 by Mr. Periyapatna Narasimhaiya, R. M., Hunsur Taluk, Nos. 277 to 279 by Mr. Muddu Viranna Shetti, R. M., for the same Taluk, No. 280 by Mr. Kyate Gauda, R. M., for the same Taluk, No. 281 by Mr. Lakke Gauda, R. M., Yedatore Taluk, and No. 282 relates to Public Works proposed for the Mysore District.

### BANGALORE DISTRICT.

**Subject. No. 177.**

**Erroneous valuation of Inam wet lands.**

*Summary of discussion.*—Inamdars are now put to much hardship by having to pay more to Government than they used to do. The excess payments are due to the following three grounds which are not fair grounds for levying more from Inamdars. The first is that the Survey Department have valued at wet rates, lands which at the time of grant were dry or jungle and have since been converted into wet by private enterprise.

*The Dewan.*—Is this so?

*Col. Grant.*—It is so. It is often impossible to ascertain whether or not the land has been rendered irrigable by private enterprise subsequent to the Inam grant. The question was never raised before in any individual case.

*Mr. Chentsal Rao.*—The claim does not seem to be justified by the principle on which the terms of enfranchisement of Inams is based. A quit-rent is imposed by way of commutation of the reversionary right of Government in the Inam village which will accrue when there is a failure of heirs. Commutation of the right should obviously be based upon the present value of the Inam, and the valuation should be made on a liberal but equitable basis with reference to the land as we find it, and not the former value of waste land and the valuation of cultivated land as matters existed at the time of the grant. The outlay on the land by the Inamdar is thus no point for consideration.

*The Dewan.*—It is a question for argument whether the reversionary right of Government should be restricted to what was granted by it, or should include improvements by grantee or others. The analogy of the English Law under which all improvements revert to the landlord, nor even of the Land Revenue Law under which on default of payment of revenue by occupant all improvements by whomsoever made are forfeited, does not obviously apply to this case. Suppose the improvements were made not by an Inamdar but by a mortgagee, and the reversionary right afterwards accrues to Government, can it be exercised as if the mortgagee's improvements did not exist? Supposing mortgagee's improvements and right vest in Inamdar, could we treat him differently from how the mortgagee would have been treated? In Malabar, the tenant is compensated for improvements when he is evicted. The Hindu Law generally accords with this I think and is very different from the English Law on the subject.

*Dewan's reply.*—(After some further discussion). The point involved is nice but has no practical significance and has never been raised before. If raised in any individual case, it will receive due attention.

**Subject No. 178.**
**Erroneous valuation of Inam waste lands.**

*Summary of discussion.*—The second reason why the Inamdar's Quit-rent is felt to be excessive is the Survey Department value Porambok lands in inam villages and this enhances the survey valuation. Arable waste is indeed taken at ¼th of the valuation of cultivated land of the same kind; and unarable waste is taken but at a nominal value. But even so, the valuation in the gross is much more than the Inamdar can ever hope to realize himself from the land. Compare this valuation with what Government realizes from its own waste lands in the neighbourhood.

*The Dewan.*—Is the Survey valuation of an inam village, as a rule, more or less than what the Inamdar himself realizes as rent from his raiyats?

*Colonel Grant.*—It is difficult to say. There are no data. In most cases it is believed to be more. It is seldom sup-